



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,201	01/29/2004	Hemant G. Rotithor	42P16971	7594

8791 7590 01/25/2007
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

KROFCHECK, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2186

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/769,201

Applicant(s)

ROTITHOR ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Krofcheck

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/10/06, 10/26/06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 10/26/2006.
2. The abstract, specification, and claims 1, 3, 5-6, 14-15, 19, 31,-32, 35, 39, 43 have been amended.
3. Replacement figures 1A, 1B, 3A, 4A, and 5A have been included to the drawings to replace their respective prior figures.
4. The objections/rejections from the prior correspondence not restated herein have been withdrawn.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed on 7/10/2006 and resubmitted on 10/26/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; ***each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed***; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

The pertinent portions of the two non-patent literature Intel documents listed on the information disclosure statement were not included with the submission, as a result they have not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for sending a header not contiguously with its respective read data return (shown in figs. 5 and 6 and their explanations), does not reasonably provide enablement for sending the header before the read data return arrives at one of the buffers. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. With respect to claims 1, 6, 19, and 31, the statement, "interleaving the first and the second pluralities of flits to be sent to a processor such that one or more flits of the second plurality of flits is sent between two consecutive flits of the first plurality of flits," renders the claim vague and indefinite as the metes and bounds of the limitation are not clear. Consecutive means following one after another without interruption, so by definition, if the two flits of the first group of flits are consecutive, they cannot have one or more flits of the second group of flits between them and still be consecutive flits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dover, US patent application publication 2003/0005239.

13. With respect to claim 43, Dover teaches of a method comprising: checking whether a buffer in a memory controller holds a critical chunk of a cache line of an oldest read return in a queue (fig. 1; paragraph 0014-0017; if the bus is busy transactions are stored in the host response queue (buffer) and if critical data is contained in the queue it is sent once the bus is available. As priority is given in the request queue to the first received data (oldest), the oldest response critical data would be received before the not oldest critical data);

sending the critical chunk from the memory controller to a processor coupled to the memory controller if the buffer holds the critical chunk (fig. 1; paragraph 0016-0017; if the bus is busy transactions are stored in the host response queue (buffer) and if critical data is contained in the queue it is sent once the bus is available to the requester (host processor));

checking whether a predetermined number of non-critical chunks of the cache line have accumulated in the buffer after the critical chunk is sent and if the predetermined number of non-critical chunks have accumulated in the buffer, sending

Art Unit: 2186

the interleaved flits of the non-critical chunks from the memory controller to the processor (paragraph 0016-0018; the host interpreter combines responses in to a burst response and stores it in the response queue (buffer). A burst operation has a set, predefined number of chunks that are transmitted with the burst).

interleaving flits of the non-critical chunks with a plurality of flits of a second cache line at the memory controller (fig. 4; paragraph 0041-0043); and

14. With respect to claim 44, Dover teaches of removing the oldest read return from the queue after sending the non-critical chunks (fig. 1; paragraph 0014-0015; as the oldest request has been completed it must be removed from the queue or else the queue would become filled with irrelevant requests and have no space for relevant ones).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

17. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

18. Claims 1-5 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA), Janzen, US patent application publication 2003/0018845, Dodd et al., US patent application publication 2003/0182513, and Dover.

19. With respect to claim 1, AAPA teaches of a method comprising: receiving at a memory controller a first read data return and a second read data return from a first memory and a second memory, respectively (fig. 1A, 1B; paragraph 0004-0005);

splitting the first read data return into a first plurality of flits and the second read data return into a second plurality of flits (paragraph 0005);

AAPA fails to specifically teach of interleaving the first and the second pluralities of flits to be sent to a processor such that one or more flits of the second plurality of flits is sent between two consecutive flits of the first plurality of flits. However, Dodd teaches of interleaving the output of a plurality of read returns (fig. 4-6, paragraph 0026).

Janzen teaches of interleaving the plurality of flits of each a read data return (paragraph 0031, 0033; each word is a flit).

Dover also teaches of interleaving the first and the second pluralities of flits to be sent to a processor such that one or more flits of the second plurality of flits is sent between two consecutive flits of the first plurality of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0041-0043).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of AAPA and Dodd at the time of the invention to interleave the read outputs from multiple memories in AAPA as taught in Dodd. Their motivation would have been to increase the bandwidth efficiency (Dodd paragraph 0026).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of AAPA, Dodd, and Janzen at the time of the invention to interleave the flits of AAPA from the as taught in Janzen. Their motivation would have been to allow the critical word to available first (Janzen, paragraph 0009, 0033).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of AAPA, Dodd, Janzen, and Dover at the time of the invention to interleave the flits of the read outputs from multiple memories in AAPA as taught in Dover. Their motivation would have been to reduce the amount of idle time and thus increase the processing efficiency Dover, paragraph 0001-0004).

20. With respect to claim 2, AAPA teaches of comprising sending the flits via a packetized interconnect (paragraph 0005).

21. With respect to claim 3, the combination of AAPA, Dodd, Janzen, and Dover teach of receiving the plurality of read data returns from a plurality of memory channels

Art Unit: 2186

in a substantially overlapped manner (Dodd, fig. 5, 8, paragraph 0026; the memory channel runs from each memory device to the controller. As in the combination of AAPA, Dodd, Janzen, and Dover, the read responses are received with the flits interleaved, and being interleaved between multiple memories, it is abundantly clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that they are received in a substantially overlapped manner).

22. With respect to claim 4, Dover teaches of a queue that prioritizes its entries based on time the request was received (fig. 1; item 135; paragraph 0014-0015).

In the combination of AAPA, Dodd, Janzen and Dover, it is abundantly clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the critical chunk of the oldest request is sent in first flits as the oldest request is sent to the memory first and Janzen teaches of the critical word being sent first. The same can be said for the next oldest request, sent after the first oldest.

23. With respect to claim 5, AAPA teaches of adding a header to each of the first and the second plurality of read data returns; and sending the header before each of the first and the second plurality of read data returns (paragraph 0007; since a header contains information critical to the data in the read response, specifically what it is, then it must be sent first, else the controller will not know what is going on).

24. Claims 31-42, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover and Dodd.

25. With respect to claim 31, Dover teaches of a method comprising: interleaving a first plurality of flits containing a first critical chunk of a first cache line and a second

Art Unit: 2186

plurality of flits containing a second critical chunk of a second cache line, the first and second pluralities of flits corresponding to a first and a second read data returns, respectively; sending the interleaved flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0041; each critical word (critical chunk) is a flit. As they are separate responses, each critical word is from a separate cache line);

Dodd teaches of sending a plurality of flits in a group (fig. 4; paragraph 0025-0026; each chunk is a flit).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover and Dodd at the time of the invention to include the sending of the flits of each response in a cluster in the order requested. Their motivation would have been to efficiently utilize the bandwidth (Dodd paragraph 0026). In the combination, since the critical data has been already sent, the remaining data is non-critical data.

26. With respect to claim 32, Dodd teaches of sending a fourth plurality of flits containing the second cache line's non-critical chunks after the third plurality of flits are sent (fig. 4; paragraph 0025-0026; each chunk is a flit. As the critical data has already been sent in the combination of Dover and Dodd, the remaining data is non-critical).

27. With respect to claim 33, Dover teaches of wherein the first and second read data returns are from a first and a second memory channels, respectively (fig. 2, 4; paragraph 0040-0041; each read response is sensed from a separate sensing device. Therefore each is from a different memory channel. Each channel connects the sensing device to the memory).

Art Unit: 2186

28. With respect to claim 34, Dover teaches of receiving the first and the second read data returns in a substantially overlapped manner (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0041; as the responses are time shifted or interleaved, they are received overlapping each other).

29. With respect to claims 35-38 and 39-42, the combination of Dover and Dodd teach of the limitations cited above with respect to claims 31-34.

30. Claim 45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover and AAPA.

31. With respect to claim 45, AAPA teaches of sending chunks via a packetized interconnect (paragraph 0005, 0007).

Dover and AAPA are analogous arts as they are both in the same field of endeavor, memory addressing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover and AAPA at the time of the invention to include the packetized interconnect to send the data words of Dover as taught in AAPA as it is typically done (AAPA paragraph 0005).

32. Additionally claims 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover and AAPA. AAPA also teaches of checking whether a predetermined number of non-critical chunks of the cache line have accumulated in the buffer after the critical chunk is sent; and sending the non-critical chunks if the predetermined number of non-critical chunks have accumulated in the buffer (paragraph 0007; where once enough chunks have accumulated in the buffer, they are sent to the

CPU. As the controller must be able to determine what "enough" is, the number must be predetermined).

33. Dependent claims 44-45 are rejected the same as above.

34. Claims 6, 16-18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover and Blanchard US patent 5793431.

35. With respect to claim 6, Dover teaches of interleaving a first and second of flits of first and second cache lines, respectively such that one or more flits of the second plurality of flits is sent between two consecutive flits of the first plurality of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0042; as the requests are processed at the same time, they must be from separate cache lines).

Dover fails to explicitly teach of a first buffer to temporarily hold a first cache line of a first read data return; a second buffer to temporarily hold a second cache line of a second read data return; and a multiplexer coupled to the first and second buffers to interleave a first and a second pluralities of flits of the first and second cache lines, respectively.

However, Blanchard teaches of a first buffer to temporarily hold a first data of a first read data return; a second buffer to temporarily hold a second data of a second read data return (fig. 8; items 16, 18; column 7, lines 45-55); and

a multiplexer coupled to the first and second buffers to interleave a first and a second pluralities of data (fig. 8; items 22; column 7, lines 45-57).

Dover and Blanchard are analogous arts as they are both in the same field of endeavor, interleaving data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2186

art having the teachings of Dover and Blanchard at the time of the invention to include the buffers corresponding to each data output and the mux used to interleave the data contained within the buffers as taught in Blanchard into the controller of Dover. Their motivation would have been to provide Dover with the hardware to combine multiple separate data streams into a single one (Blanchard abstract).

In the combination of Dover and Blanchard, the buffers correspond to the number of requests for data that the controller can handle at one time, thus each one holds a cache line.

36. With respect to claim 16, Dover teaches of wherein the first and second read data returns arrive from a first memory channel and a second memory channel, respectively, in a substantially overlapped manner (fig. 2; paragraph 0023, 0028; where the response arbiter can send the response data with word granularity in a time sliced manner (i.e. overlapping). The separate responses are sent from the memory unit to the sensing units over separate channels as each sensing unit acts upon its own request).

37. With respect to claims 17 and 18, the combination of Dover and Blanchard teaches of a third and fourth buffer as taught above with respect to the first and second buffer. Dover teaches of handling more than one request simultaneously (paragraph 0015) and the example of figs. 2 and 4 show three requests, which would require three of Blanchard's buffers in the combination of Dover and Blanchard. Dover teaches of handling N requests in parallel (paragraph 0052), it is abundantly clear that this includes four.

Art Unit: 2186

38. Claim 7-8, 10-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover and Blanchard as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of AAPA.

39. With respect to claim 7, AAPA teaches of an interface to output the chunks in two packets (paragraph 0007; packetized interconnect (interface) outputs the chunks for each cache line in their own packet; thus for two cache lines and two requests, there would be two packets).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Blanchard and AAPA at the time of the invention to include the packetized interconnect as taught in AAPA to send the request responses in the combination of Dover and Blanchard as it is typically done (AAPA paragraphs 0005, 0007).

In the combination of Dover, Blanchard, and AAPA, the data outputted would be interleaved as is taught in Dover, cited previously.

40. With respect to claim 8, Dover teaches of time-multiplexing the first and the second pluralities of flits in a plurality of time slots to interleave the first and second pluralities of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0042; where the words are flits). In the combination of Dover, Blanchard, and AAPA this is done by the multiplexer in Blanchard.

41. With respect to claim 10, Dover teaches of statically time-multiplexes the first and the second pluralities of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0042; as the words are interleaved in fixed time intervals). In the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA, this would be done by the multiplexer of Blanchard.

42. With respect to claim 11, AAPA teaches of wherein the chunks are sent via a packetized interconnect to a processor (paragraph 0005, 0007). In the combination of Dover and Blanchard and AAPA the data words/flits are interleaved.

43. With respect to claim 12, Dover teaches of wherein a critical chunk of the first read data return is sent in one or more flits of the first plurality of flits and a critical chunk of the second read data return is sent in one or more flits of the second plurality of flits (fig. 4; paragraphs 0040-0042; where the critical data for each response is sent in the first data word (flit) of that response).

44. With respect to claim 13, AAPA teaches of wherein a header is added to each of the first and second cache lines (paragraph 0007).

The combination of Dover and Blanchard and AAPA are analogous arts as they are both in the same field of endeavor, memory accessing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Blanchard and AAPA at the time of the invention to add a header to each of the responses containing the cache line as taught in AAPA in the combination of Dover and Blanchard as it is typical in a packetized interconnect (AAPA paragraphs 0005, 0007).

45. With respect to claim 14, AAPA teaches of wherein a header is sent after the corresponding read data return starts arriving at one of the first and the second buffers (paragraph 0007).

46. Claim 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover, Blanchard and AAPA as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Osborne, US patent application publication 2003/0093632.

47. With respect to claim 15, the combination of Dover, Blanchard and AAPA fails to explicitly teach of the header is sent before the corresponding read data return starts arriving at one of the first and the second buffers. However, Osborne teaches of the header is sent before the corresponding read data return starts arriving (fig. 6a; paragraph 0050-0051; As the header is sent out from the memory when the read is initiated, therefore it is before the read data is received).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Blanchard, AAPA and Osborne at the time of the invention to send the read header before receiving the read results in the combination of of Dover, Blanchard, and AAPA as taught in Osborne. Their motivation would have been to further optimize memory read operations (Osborne, abstract).

48. Claim 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover, Blanchard, and AAPA as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Hollums, US patent application publication 2002/0188905.

49. With respect to claim 9, The combination of Dover, Blanchard, and AAPA fails to explicitly teach of dynamically time-multiplexing. However, Hollums teaches of dynamically time-multiplexes the first and the second pluralities of flits (fig. 3d, paragraph 0064-0066).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Blanchard, AAPA and Hollums at the time of the invention to incorporate the process of dynamically interleaving the words in the combination of Dover, Blanchard,

and AAPA as taught in Hollums. Their motivation would have been to more optimally interleave the data with different interleave depths (Hollums, paragraph 0064-0065).

In the combination of Dover, Blanchard, AAPA, and Hollums, this would be done by the multiplexer of Blanchard.

50. Claims 19, 25-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard.

51. With respect to claim 19, Dover teaches of a system comprising: a first plurality of dynamic random access memory ("DRAM") devices (fig. 1, item 150);

a DRAM channel coupled to the first plurality of DRAM devices (fig. 1; item 140);

memory controller coupled to the first DRAM channel (fig. 1; item 120);

interleaving a first and second of flits of first and second cache lines, respectively such that one or more flits of the second cache line is sent between two consecutive flits of the first cache line (fig. 4; paragraph 0021, 0040-0042; as the requests are processed at the same time, they must be from separate cache lines).

Dover fails to explicitly teach of a second plurality of DRAM devices; a second DRAM channel coupled to the second plurality of DRAM devices; the memory controller including a first buffer to temporarily hold a first cache line of a first read data return from the first DRAM channel; a second buffer to temporarily hold a second cache line of a second read data return from the second DRAM channel; and a multiplexer coupled to the first and second buffers to interleave flits of the first and second cache lines.

However, Dodd teaches of a second plurality of DRAM devices (fig. 5, 8; paragraph 0004, 0026);

a second DRAM channel coupled to the second plurality of DRAM devices (fig. 5, 8; paragraph 0026; shown in fig. 5; a channel is connected from each memory to the bus 16)

Blanchard teaches of a first buffer to temporarily hold a first data of a first read data return; a second buffer to temporarily hold a second data of a second read data return (fig. 8; items 16, 18; column 7, lines 45-55); and

a multiplexer coupled to the first and second buffers to interleave a first and a second pluralities of data (fig. 8; items 16, 18; column 7, lines 45-55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover and Dodd at the time of the invention to include multiple memory devices/ranks and their channels as taught in Dodd into Dover. Their motivation would have been to increase the amount of data that can be stored in the DRAM.

The combination of Dover, and Dodd, and Blanchard are analogous arts as they are both in the same field of endeavor, interleaving data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard at the time of the invention to include the buffers corresponding to each data output and the mux used to interleave the data contained within the buffers as taught in Blanchard into the controller corresponding to each memory in the combination of Dover and Dodd. Their motivation would have been to provide the combination of Dover and Dodd with the hardware to combine multiple separate data streams into a single one (Blanchard abstract).

In the combination of Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard, the buffers correspond to each of the memory devices that the controller is attached to, thus each one holds a cache line from the request to that respective memory.

52. With respect to claim 25, Dover teaches of wherein a critical chunk of each of the first and second read data returns is sent in one or more flits (fig. 4; paragraphs 0040-0042; where the critical data for each response is sent in the first data word (flit) of that response).

53. With respect to claim 26, Dover teaches of wherein the memory controller receives the first and second read data returns in a substantially overlapped manner (fig. 2; paragraph 0023, 0028; where the response arbiter can send the response data with word granularity in a time sliced manner (i.e. overlapping))

54. With respect to claim 27, Dover teaches of further comprising a processor coupled to the memory controller to receive the interleaved flits of the first and second cache lines (fig. 1, items 100, 105; paragraph 0013).

55. With respect to claim 28, Dover teaches of wherein the processor comprises a demultiplexer to separate the flits received (paragraph 0040-0042; As the words (flits) are sent in an interleaved fashion to the host (processor), it is abundantly clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the host contains a demux to "decode" the words).

56. With respect to claims 29 and 30, the combination of Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard teaches of a third and fourth buffer as taught above with respect to the first and second buffer. Dodd teaches of additional memory devices (paragraph 0026). Dover teaches of handling more than one request simultaneously (paragraph 0015) and

the example of figs. 2 and 4 show three requests. With each memory requiring a buffer from Blanchard in the combination of Dover and Blanchard, four DRAMs would require four buffers. Dover teaches of handling N requests in parallel (paragraph 0052), it is abundantly clear that this includes four.

57. Claim 20-21, 23-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of AAPA.

58. With respect to claim 20, AAPA teaches of an interface to output the chunks in two packets (paragraph 0005, 0007; packetized interconnect outputs the chunks for each cache line in their own packet; thus for two cache lines and two requests, there would be two packets).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard and AAPA at the time of the invention to include the packetized interconnect as taught in AAPA to send the request responses in the controller of combination of Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard as it is typically done (AAPA paragraphs 0005, 0007).

In the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA, the data outputted would be interleaved as is taught in Dover, cited previously.

59. With respect to claim 21, Dover teaches of time-multiplexing the first and the second pluralities of flits in a plurality of time slots to interleave the first and second pluralities of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0042; where the words are flits). In the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA this is done by the multiplexer in Blanchard.

60. With respect to claim 23, Dover teaches of statically time-multiplexes the first and the second pluralities of flits (fig. 4; paragraph 0040-0042; as the words are interleaved in fixed time intervals). In the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA, this would be done by the multiplexer of Blanchard.

61. With respect to claim 24, AAPA teaches of a packetized interconnect coupled to the memory controller to send the chunks (paragraph 0005, 0007). In the combination of Dover, Dodd, and Blanchard and AAPA the data words/flits are interleaved.

62. Claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Hollums.

63. With respect to claim 22, Hollums teaches of dynamically time-multiplexes the first and the second pluralities of flits (fig. 3d, paragraph 0064-0066).

The combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA and Hollums are analogous arts as they are both in the same field of endeavor, interleaving data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, AAPA and Hollums at the time of the invention to incorporate the process of dynamically interleaving the words in the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, and AAPA as taught in Hollums. Their motivation would have been to more optimally interleave the data with different interleave depths (Hollums, paragraph 0064-0065).

In the combination of Dover, Dodd, Blanchard, AAPA, and Hollums, this would be done by the multiplexer of Blanchard.

Response to Arguments

64. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

65. With respect to the 112 first paragraph rejection of claim 15, the applicant cites paragraph 55 of the application's specification and figure 6C. The claim speaks of the header being send before the read data return starts arriving at one of the buffers. There is no mention of or indication of the read data return arriving at ***one of the buffers*** in the cited section of the specification and figure.

66. With respect to the claims rejected under Dover, the applicant argues that Dover fails to teach of ***interleaving flits*** of the non-critical chunks with a plurality of flits of a second cache line at the memory controller, stating that the words of Dover are not flits because the memory device of Dover is not a packetized interconnect. The examiner disagrees. In paragraph 29, the applicant's specification states, "a flit is the granularity at which the link layer of the packetized interconnect sends data." So, a flit is basically the smallest distinguishable increment of data for a packetized interconnect. Comparatively, a word is the smallest addressable data in a memory. Thus a flit and a word are in essence the same thing. The claims do not limit the flits of the invention to being only in a packetized interconnect as the applicant alludes to on page 19 of the response, and to assume that they do reads in limitations which are not present in the claims, which is improper.

67. In response to applicant's arguments against the references (Janzen, Dodd) individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

68. With respect to claim 6 and 19, the applicant argues that Blanchard fails to teach of a multiplexer coupled to the first and second buffers to interleave a first and second pluralities of flits. The examiner disagrees. Figure 8 and column 7, lines 53-57 of Blanchard discloses a multiplexer (22) that interleaves the output of two buffers (16, 18).

69. In response to applicant's argument that Blanchard is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Blanchard is a computer data system that interleaves data. Interleaving data is clearly reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned.

Conclusion

70. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2186

71. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

72. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

73. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Krofcheck whose telephone number is 571-272-8193. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.


74. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2186

75. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Krofcheck



MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100